

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 10, 12, 14-26, 28, and 31-44 are pending in the present application, Claim 11, 13, 27, and 29-30 were previously canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 8, and 26 have been presently amended. No new matter was added.

Claims 1-10, 12, 14-28 and 31-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leet et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,769).

Regarding the outstanding art rejection, Claim 1 as amended defines:

An address inquiry system for informing an inquirer of a new address of a changer based on an old address of the changer via an Internet, the old address having been changed to the new address, the system comprising:

a data base relationally storing at least the old address, the new address, and an address disclosing condition capable of setting a condition whereby the changer judges whether to give permission to disclose the new address;

a means for searching the new address corresponding to the old address and the address disclosing condition from the data base when the inquirer sends an inquiry including the old address;

a means for making the changer confirm whether the new address is disclosed when the address disclosing condition in searching includes the set condition; and

a means for informing the inquirer of the new address via the system when the changer permits the disclosure of the new address.

Thus, the system stores 1) an old address, 2) a new address, and 3) an address disclosing condition, and the system informs the inquirer of a new address when the changer permits the disclosure of the new address.

The final Office Action dated October 30, 2006 relies on Lee et al's disclosure at col. 7, lines 26-50. Applicant submits that Lee et al's disclosure does not anticipate all the claim elements of Claim 1 including the above-noted features. Indeed, the examiner's attention is directed to M.P.E.P. § 2131 which requires for anticipation that *each and every feature* of the claimed invention must be shown *in as complete detail as is contained in the claim*.

Application No. 09/875,208  
Reply to Office Action of June 21, 2007

Applicant respectfully request that the examiner show specifically where Lee et al disclose these features *in as complete detail as is contained in the claim* or withdraw the rejection.


With there being no showing in detail of where the elements of Claim 1 are shown, Applicant believes that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Lee et al. For similar reasons, Applicant submits that independent Claims 8 and 26 have not been shown to be anticipated.

Hence Claims 1, 8, and 26 and the claims dependent therefrom are believed to patentably define over Lee et al.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Steven P. Weihrouch  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 32,829

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 45,618